# DENNIS RESERVE 2018 DRAFT MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION 

RESULTS \& ADVICE

## Dennis Reserve Master Plan

Community Feedback Summary - TENNIS COURTS
Consultation conducted Oct-Nov 2018

Summary
Submitter

Strength
$=$ Submitter has more than one comment in that topic

| 11 submitters expressed broad approval for the proposed tennis courts. Of these - 5 imply that they are much needed - 3 note their approval of the alignment/layout in particular | Submiter 22 | The new tennis courts are welcome and a much needed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Submiter 23 | Extra courts Not much else |  |
|  | Submiter 48 | The number of tennis courts is increased to four.. at bes |  |
|  | Submiter 49 | The indusion of four new couts is great |  |
|  | Submiter 02 | Istrongly support the need for 2 more tennis courts in |  |
|  | Submiter 07 | The enlarged tenis courts, |  |
|  | Submitter 45 | Good utilisation of space Improving tennis failities |  |
|  | Submiter 21 | Maximising space for 4 courts .... and bringing together |  |
|  | Submiter 26 | Increased tennis courts, improving long term viability of existing club and supporting court shortage |  |
|  | Submiter 44 | more courts of which are bally needed |  |
|  | Submiter 47 | Fur tennis couts are needed to meet the clubs needs. |  |
|  | Submiter 39 | Great! love the idea of Tennis Courts running along the East side of providing we can replace the exiting [existing?] trees to the east boundary |  |
|  | Submiter 46 | The master plan makes better use of the space on the reserve by aligning the tennis courts parallel to one side of the reserve and by making available space previously allocated to the ladies bowls club for tennis courts. |  |
|  | Submiter 40 | the tennis cours ayyut. |  |
| 2 submitters not satisfied that the courts are not exactly oriented northsouth | Submiter 47 |  | Tennis courts not north/south facing which is ideal. |
|  | Submiter 09 |  | Tennis Courts need to be constructed in a North/South direction for compliance with National and International Standards |
| 8 submitters expressed broad disapproval of the expanded the tennis courts | Submiter 29 |  | enlargement of tennis court, encroaching on public, passive green spaces. This is EXPANSION not an upgrade - we don't all use this public space |
|  | Submiter 28 |  | expansion of tenis courts |
|  | Submiter 37 |  | The Master P Pann needs to be amended, with no more than 2 tennis courts (preferarall 0 ) on site |
|  | Submiter 15 |  | [not clear what they're referring to] <br> Language in the keys features states RECONFIGURATION of exisiting courts NOT major expansion! |
|  | Submiter 05 |  | Too much space devoted to Tennis. |
|  | Submiter 06 |  | Expansion of the tennis club to four courts - which removes open PUBLIC space, and is a totally inappropriate use of this land. |
|  | Submiter 19 |  | the space occupied by the redundant bowling green] Shame it's then lost gain with 2 additional tennis couts |
|  | Submiter 27 |  | The tennis courts are too large and taking up valuable crown which the public |

Summary
Submitter Strengths $\stackrel{C}{C o m m}$


Summary
Submitter
\& \& prioritisation

| 8 submitters assert that a higher priority is being granted to the ennis club at the expense of the broader community. <br> Most highlight the comparatively small number of tennis players that will benefit and subsequent imbalance of the offering. | Submiter 32 | Struggling to see the strength in the proposed plan. Tr as I can - its lost on me. I guess it would be good for people who like to play tennis. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subititer 48 |  |  size makes me very angry. |
|  | nite |  | priointy in terms of space given to small number of tennis players compared to the very large group of people who use this park on a daily basis |
|  | niter 3 |  | Allowing unfétered accesss to many in the community will serve more people than the limited number who belong to a tennis club |
|  | Submiter 1 |  | I do not feel four tennis courts are in the best interests of the Hobsons Bay community. The tennis needs survey revealed that a minority of residents play tennis and they all reside in Williamstown (or overwhelmingly so). |
|  | Submiter 34 |  | Having participated in the master plan process, 1 am underwhelmed and confused by the draft master pan. It tifers so itite to of of of the local community of Dennis Reserve and so Reserve, and so much to the 180 (approximater nese |
|  | Sumiter |  |  |
|  | Submiter 16 |  | Closing off an area of public land and continuing to make it available to a small section of the community for sporadic use does a disservice to the larger munity |
|  | Submiter 37 |  | The aesthetics of a shared environment and the preservation of common spaces helps create a sense of community and belonging for citizens of Hobsons Bay an Williamstown locals. Having a small group of people have a disproportionately high impact on the commen lyink, seems very undemocratic and this is especially so, so close to government democracy |
| 11 submitters raise concerns about the privatisation of the space. Potential limitations (financial, timing) placed on public access to the tennis courts <br> Negative visual connotations of a fenced off space in a public park | itter 36 |  | Locking the whole place under 2 more courts that exclude the majority of people, will limit use to perimeter walking, dis-allowing people to engage in outdoor environments that potentiate health and have long lasting future ramifications. |
|  | Submiter 38 |  | Will the new courts be avaliable for public use? |
|  | Submitter 18 |  |  <br> the club as a family is expensive and some don't want that commitment. |
|  | bibmiter |  |  health care and parks for all citizens... <br> Tennis courts end up becoming fenced off, occasionally used private spaces. It should be accessible to everyone in the community and the opportunity to use the bill |
|  | Submiter 48 |  |  |
|  | Submiter 37 |  | The master plan presented here calls for more tennis courts on the site - more tennis courts in this community space means more very high wire fences that cut sight lines across the site and exclude the majority of the community from enjoying the space. |
|  | Submiter 34 |  | do not think that HBCC has convinced the community that 2 more tennis courts being developed for tennis ONLY, is the most appropriate use for the precious space available in Dennis Reserve |
|  | Subitter 15 |  | in HBCC Open Space Strategyl l A focus for this precinct is rese ace and EENCED, select entry open space accessible only by paying a fee and joining a club. |
|  | Submiter 06 |  | Tennis courts are not' open space' they are restricted, fenced and more suited to another site. |


| Summary | Submitter | Community Feedback |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Strengths | Weaknesses \& Uncertainty |
| Tennis courts - singular use |  |  |  |
| 2 submitters are critical of the single-use nature of the tennis courts. | Submiter 01 |  | That the space lacks multipurpose. The tennis courts could also convert into much needed netball and basketball courts and be utilized by a broader range of Williamstown residents. |
|  | submiter 14 |  | single use spaces - again in contradiction with HBCC OSS - plan release virtually no open space back to the community |



Dennis Reserve Master Plan

## Community Feedback Summary - OPEN SPACE

Consultation conducted Oct-Nov 2018
Summary
Submitter $\qquad$ Community Feedback

## Open space - general

## 11 submitiers expressed broad approval tor the proposed teanis

 approval tor the proposed tencouts. Ofthes
-5 imply that they are much
-5 imply that they are much
needed
-3 note their approval of the
-3 Inote heir approvalof hee
alignmentlayoutin in particular

| Sumitite 07 | ${ }^{\text {the open space }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summiter 40 | improved open space |  |
| submiter 45 | Better open space |  |
| Submiter 47 | Provides more usable open space. |  |
| Sumititer 01 | The increased green space. |  |
| Submiter 03 | More green areas -both for relaxing, thoroughfare and |  |
|  | play. |  |
| Submiter 39 | The new layout appears to have crated a good area of open space which is largely internal - away from roads |  |
| Submiter 05 |  | Not enough space devoled toftee range open space. |
| Submiter 08 |  | Reduction of poen space. |
| Summiter 13 |  | The 'new play space' and "new open green space" appears to be no larger than half of one of the bowls greens |
| Submiter 20 |  | Not enough passive landscape |
| Sumbiter 29 |  | -the amount of passive green space for the community does not seem to have |
|  |  | been increased - the second park located near the proposed tennis court - is this needed? lets make the main park the best it can be and maintain the quiet, passive space make the main park the be tree |
| sumiter 19 |  | Lost opportunity to create more open space as per Councils own Open Space |
| Summiter 25 |  | Loss of opportunity to develop area with park site open space. The existing area cover the park is great. We are losing that at a time when the issue is more |
| Libiter |  | With hotter summers, we must protect public green areas, they provide shade, habitat and cooling 'sinks'. Tree-dominated greenspace offers greater heat stress relief when most required, reducing it is short-sighted and contrary to the concept of creating sustainable, comfortable, urban environments. |

## Open space - passive recreation

| 4 submitters view the masterplan as conflicting with the HBCC Open Space Strategy due to the limited space. | Subuniter 35 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | sumiter |  |  |
|  | sumiter 36 |  | I feel this is in conflict with Council's own Open Spaces Strategy; "quality passive open space with a range of settings and facilities to cater to the diverse local community...p103" |
|  | Submiter 16 |  | Too much space devoted to Tennis. |
| 5 submitters observe that previous community consultations have indicated a higher preference for increased pubic open green the masterplan does not adequately respond to this | Submiter |  | Initial consultations and community comment favoured the site be made into public open space or a community garden, and I believe this is still the view in the community. However, plans have now been put forward for two additional courts for the existing tennis club. |
|  | niter |  |  |
|  | Subumiter 16 |  | Overwhelmingly all the surveys conducted by HBCC showed a support for the return of open space to the community |
|  | Subumiter 12 |  | The community survey undertaken prior to the tennis needs assessment overwhelmingly asked for this area to be utilized as green open space. I feel the community needs to be listened to. |
|  | Subniter 14 |  | all suveys conducted by HBCCC have communtity wating open green space for |



|  | Submiter 15 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 submitters are concerned about the incremental loss of public open space in the local area | summiter 36 |  |

Dennis Reserve Master Plan
$=$ Submitter has more than one comment in that topit


| Submiter 36 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | disregard to history of the site: the Ladies bowls Building... should not be |
| Removal of Ladies' Bowling Pavilion: <br> - 2 submitters saw this as a good thing <br> 6 submitters saw this negatively, with 2 questioning whether its heritage value has been assessed. | Subuiter 41 |  | Not providing an upgrade to the exssing bowing club roms. |
|  | Summiter 14 |  | Ladies Bowing Pavilion of fistorical interest - should be restored |
|  | Submiter 32 |  | The site is of historical significance: - Ladies Bowling Pavilion should be assessed for it historical value |
|  | Submiter 16 |  | The Edwardian Ladides Bowing Club Pavilion contribues to the herilige value of |
|  | subiter 19 |  | Have other options in regards to restoring existing buildings (Bowls Pavilion) been looked into? Shame to lose what appears to be a heritage building that fits within the character of the area. |
|  | Subutiter 12 | Emova of the ladies bowing club |  |
|  | Summiter 13 | The defunct Ladies Bowls Club looks very sad. Although i'd rather see it replaced with trees and be an inviting space for all of the community |  |


| 12 submitters expressed generally positive sentiments re the new also encourages partial retention of the old building (see above) | ubitite 05 | Improvements to builidigs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Submiter 40 | a new community building |  |
|  | Sumiter 47 | New community buiding is much needed. |  |
|  | Summiter 49 | The new multi use facility is great along with a central open space for public use. |  |
|  | Submiter 10 | Mixed use and sensors [seniors?] building to be converted to a community centre. |  |
|  | summiter 33 | Firstly, it is very exciting to see that the community building is to be retained. |  |
|  | Sumiter 26 | Shored dilisation [Shared utilisation? of new bulidings |  |
|  | Sumiter 35 | The Master Plan does allow for continuation of important community activities now carried out in the Senior Citizens building. Senior Citizens building. |  |
|  | Subuiter 29 | inmorements of senior citizens buildings $\rightarrow$ a and |  |
|  | Subiter 44 | beteres senior ditizens club |  |
|  | Subuiter 45 | Improvising Inproving?] Senior c Citizens facilities |  |
|  | Summiter 03 | The public toilet failities are excellent too. |  |


| Summary | Submitter | Community Feedback |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Strengths | Weaknesses \& Uncertainty |

New Community Centre - Size \& Configuration

| Regarding overall size of the new community centre: <br> submitter supportive of 1 mising the building footprint 1 submitters concerned it may not be big enough for all us be big enough for all users |  | Having a community facility that can be shared by multi users to maximise facility and minimise footprint on the reserve <br> on the reserve |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }^{\text {Submitier } 46}$ |  |  |
| 5 submitters concerned that not enough detail is provided, particularly re. internal allocations of space. | Summiter 38 |  | he plan for the enew multi-purp |
|  | Submiter 22 |  | Hopefilly this szze of the new Senior citizensTenis Club fadility wil be d into areas for each group |
|  | Submiter 47 |  | Council did not have any plans ori ideas about tayout of new community builing. |
|  | Subniter 02 |  | The master plan is shot on details rega |
|  | Submiter 38 |  | The plan lacks dealis for the public toilets |



| Tennis Club requires storage and display facilities | Submiter 09 |  | [re meeting current needs of competition in the construction of new tennis courts] - The tennis club has a designated area of the new facility to hang flags/memorabillia and some storage capacity for coaching equipment etc |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loom Room requires high level of natural light in new building | Submi |  |  |

Dennis Reserve Master Plan

## Community Feedback Summary - MOVEMENT \& SAFETY

Consultation conducted Oct-Nov 2018

| Summary | Submitter | Community Feedback |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Strengths | Weaknesses \& Uncertainty |
|  |  | = Submitter has more than one | topic |
| Pathways - general |  |  |  |
| Mixed responses to the inclusion of new paths. <br> - 2 supportive <br> -4 perceive them as impinging on green space | ${ }^{\text {Submitter } 12}$ | New paths |  |
|  | Subniter 05 | New patweys |  |
|  | Submiter 04 |  |  |
|  | Submiter 14 |  | exta pathways also impinge on green space, |
|  | Submiter 28 |  | too many paths |
|  | Submiter 03 |  | The current gravel paths around the heritage tree/garden is too big making it not easy to walk or ride on. This space could be used much better. It is rarely used at grass/ green area to kick a ball or a more attractive relaxing garden. |


|  | Submiter 38 | I agree with the new granitic sand paths and the new perimeter path connection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Submiter 29 |  | pathwas - must be soft surfaces to allow raininal absoption |
|  | Submiter 13 |  | Is the new continuous path along Melbourne Rd to be a hard surface? If so, |
|  | Submiter 35 |  | If the new continuous path along Melbourne Rd is to be a hard surface where will the water drain to? |

Lighting \& safety

| Apparent hydrandgeas are perceived by one person to be dangerous. | Sumbiter 3 |  | The hyderangers [hydrangeas?] lalong Lyons Street are currenty dangerous. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subiter 12 | New.. İghting |  |
| Mixed perceptions of lighting \& | Sumiter 03 | Increased safely |  |
| -2 concerned abut impacts of ight | summiter 41 |  | Increase the ilghting of pants for right use. |
| - ${ }^{\text {spli on }}$ - arkeighburs | Submiter 51 |  | Poiential impacts that lighting may have on neabiv reside |
| Iighting tor sately | Smite 07 |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 submitters raised general concerns about the safety and egibility of unsignalised crossing points into the site, particularly: Lyons St - pedestrian paths terminating at the road without a formal crossing | Subniter 03 |  | Pathways and access. There are several access points at present where the path leads to Melbourne Road, but there is no driveway/gutter to guide you to where |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Please improve the safety of the Pedestrian crossing at the end of Perry Street. Cars are parked too close and sometines cars cannot see children. |
|  |  |  | Please improve how people exit Dennis Reserve both at Melbourne Road (Perry and Ferguson and Pasco ends) as well as crossing at Lyons Street. Limit the peos you want people exiting and really invest in that access point |
|  | Submiter 07 |  | The locaito as to where the walking path meets Lrons Street |
| Beter a cecess noted by 1 submitter | Subniter 03 | Beter accoss points. The extraitte joining path near |  |


| Summary | Submitter | Sommunity Feedback |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weaknesses \& Uncertainty |

Pathways - Melbourne Road edge

| Re. the new path along the - Melbourne Road edge of Dennis Reserve: <br> 3 submitter supportive <br> - 2 submitters see new edge paths as superflous to footpaths already on the opposite sides of the road on the opposite sides of the road | Sumiter 38 | ${ }^{\text {Ragree with he new continuous palt along Melboume }}$ Real |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Submiter 06 | Instalalion ofa pathway along Melburne Rd fronlege |  |
|  | Submiter 03 | The lit patiway alog Melburne Road is exellent. |  |
|  | Subniter 31 |  | The proposal lo puta footpath in along the Melburne Rd Edge of the part |
|  |  |  | Waste of onene and resurces, The oposites side has a very wide, very uly expanse of pevement already, By |
|  |  |  | puting in more concreie we ere again reduluing the cooling potenitial f f green |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | doing some PRoPER stret planning. |
|  | biniter 42 |  | There are no exsting pathways down the southem (triangel end of the reseeve. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Streit Meliburne Road and vice vers. Userso of the playyround divive tothe |
|  |  |  | facility Lyons Street then cross over the road |

Existing Central Path - Melbourne Rd to Lyons St

| 4 submitters expressed support for retaining and improving the existing central path running east-west. | niter al | The improved lighting along the existing pathway linking Melbourne Rd and Lyons Street. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Submiter 38 |  |  |
|  | Submiter 06 | Improvement of the open space areas along the path linking Lyons St and Melbourne Rd. |  |
|  | Submiter 46 | Maintaining the path from Lyons Street to Melbourne Road in its current location is good. |  |



Dennis Reserve Master Plan
Community Feedback Summary - PLAYGROUNDS \& OTHER Consultation conducted Oct-Nov 2018

## ELEMENTS



Submitter $\quad$ Strengths
= Submitter has more than one comment in that topic

| Playgrounds | Submitter has more than one comment in the |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Reduction of play space. |
| 1 submitter opposes an apparent reduction in play space | Subuiter 08 |  |  |
| General positive sentiment re playground upgrade by 3 submitters | Sumitier 07 | The upgrade of the exsiting play equipment |  |
|  | Subitier 18 | kids playround will receive a much needed upgrade |  |
|  | Subitier 40 | The playground area with the enhancement elements of shade and the equipment looks like a good improvement |  |
|  | Sumitier 36 | acknowledgement of alternative users beyond Tennis albeit tiny. |  |
| The general idea of two playgrounds $\qquad$ - opposed by 9 submitters The location of the playground received mixed responses (see below). | Submiter 42 |  | Two olpyygrounds would be a great idea as this would spread the usage and provide experiences for dififerent |
|  | Submiter 19 |  | Not sure why we need 2 playgrounds in the one park. Playgrounds are expensive to maintain and resources would be better spent improving some of the existing playgrounds we have or replace missing Date Palms in the avenue. |
|  | Submiter 03 |  | Two playgrounds are not necessary. One shaded safe good playground would be better than 2. Please decided on one playground area and invest in that one. Kinder children use the space a lot after sessions. I know the park and frequent it a lot. |
|  | Summiter 28 |  | second, unneessaray play fround |
| Only improving the existing playground supported by submitters | submiter 01 |  | Rather than having two small playgrounds that both provide minimal equipment to play on. Money would be better spent making the existing playground bigger. |
|  | Subuiter 07 |  | the new play equipment that abut 27 L Lons Street |
|  | Submiter 38 |  | the existing play area at the soutern end the garden is renovated and <br> near the new courts. This area could be part of the new open green space area. |
| Relocating the playgroundsupootred by 3 submitters- sfatety concerns- proximity to the kindergarten- proximity to parking | submiter 15 |  | Not condensing the playground into one safe area to the rear of the kinder on previous ladies bowling green, rather than creating a second playground and leaving the narrow space toward the point (and dangerous road space) |
|  | Submiter 06 |  | The continued placement of a playground in the triangle at the southern end. lose to both busy roads and a major intersection. <br> The redesign of Dennis Reserve should have been an opportunity to remove the playground from this inappropriate area and place it further to the north (instead of kindergarten is, where there is on street parking and where it is safe. <br> Fencing or screening the playground is NOT the answer. It's what you do when you don't have an option (and you do) |
|  | Submiter 48 |  | I would have hoped that his was an opportunity to move the current playground from it's very dangerous location at the southern end to where the Ladies Bowling playground is plain and simply in the wrong location. |
| 6 submitters in total expressed concern over the safety of the current location of the playground. - 2 suggested barriers around existing <br> - 4 advocated relocation rather than barriers (see above) | Submiter 29 |  | safety of children's park. rather than fencing in or leaving open to Melbourne Rd, should be 'enclosed' by green perimeter |
|  | Summiter 16 | If the current playground is to be retained the idea of enhancing it and creating a greater safety barrier between the equipment and the road is a good idea. |  |


| 3 encouraged more seating particularly near areas of activity such as the playground | Submiter 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Much more seating [around current playground] that } \\ & \text { would allow people to sit and enjoy the space around } \\ & \text { the play equipment would be wonderful. } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sbmiter 41 |  | along the pathsplaygroundcommunity building |
|  | Submiter 36 |  | lack of any spaces for seating in a park, no slowing down and using the open space, just paths that are around the perimeter: longer/noisier/not what pedestrians want in a park |
| 1 request for more detail on playground \& boundary design | Submiter 42 |  | Can you elaborate on how the existing playground will be updated? Will it use more space; what equipment will be built/retained; what form will safety perimeter take? take? |


| Summary | Submitter | Community Feedback |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weaknesses \& Uncertainty |  |

## Alternative uses

| 1 does not support fountains | Subuniter 42 |  | It was mentioned that this southern triangle will be beautified by the addition of features such as fountains. This is not appropriate for this reserve. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 Submiters propose atterative | iter |  | Why don't we have a community garden there a la St Kilda? I can think of many other better uses for the are |
| uses: <br> - community garden | Submitter 26 |  | ertuily to make area senvice more rate payers. eg, cafe in gari |
| 4 Submitters highlight the need to cater to user groups from outside Dennis Reserve, particularly older children / high school students | Sumiter 03 |  | Some equipment tor oldee kids is also required. |
|  | iter 16 |  | Workers in the area and school groups using the town hall are often looking for open spaces nearby to enhance their visit. The plan should aim to provide much needed space for teenage members of the community (proximity to Williamstown High School) who are currently underserved for passive outdoor space at which <br> they are made welcome. |
|  | ${ }^{32}$ |  | This space is enjoyed as a corridor between the housing and retail area and is especially used by Williamstown High School students. Our teenagers need gree ces to gather |
|  | Submiter 36 |  | No alternative use apart from commute-type walkers on those peripheral paths fo those who like to play basket/down/handball on a multipurpose $1 / 2$ court set up such as outside Melbourne Museum in Exhibition Gardens. What a great place fo young citizens to come and play/meet/feel like they are valued |


| Parking |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 respondents express concern insufficient parking provision, 2 of whom questioning its specific location | Submitter 15 |  | Parking is already an issue in the vicinity <br> Lack of parking |
|  | Submiter 42 |  | no allowance for car parking |
|  | Submiter 35 |  | There is no space specified in the Plan for accessible parking for the new community building |
|  | Submiter 13 |  | Where on the plan is the space for accessille parking tor the enew community |
|  | Summiter 38 |  | The plan lacks details for the access to accessible parking? Where will the parking area be? Presently there is off street parking near the Senior Citizens building off Melbourne Road, will this be retained? |
| Re the location of ancillary parking 2 respondents imply that it should not displace potential open green ce in the reserve -1 respondent advocates retaining it on the reserve | 'sumiteo |  | Land between the proposed new Elderly Citizens/Tennis Club building and Melbourne Road should have an area for car parking |
|  | Submiter 46 | inlaining open space on the resereve is good rather |  |
|  | submiter 48 |  | community building - but this is not shown on the Master Plan. If this parking is going to be on the reserve then that is yet more green space that is no for the public. And it is wrong that the Mater Plan does not show this. |

Dennis Reserve Master Plan
Community Feedback Summary - TREES \& LANDSCAPE heritage


Heritage - original design intent


| Summary | Submitter | Community Feedback |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Strengths | Weaknesses \& Uncertainty |
| Memorial palm trees |  |  |  |
| 4 submitters value the retention of the memorial palm trees, 3 of whom are concerned as to whether them | Submiter 38 | Pagree with relalining the existing Canary Istand Palm trees |  |
|  | Subuiter 35 |  | The palms in the Reserve are the remnant ones planted in memory of some of the men who died in WW1. Why is preservation of these not detailed in the Master Plan? 'There are established trees along the intended path. How will they be protected in the building of a path? <br> 'There are established tree in the building of a path? |
|  | Subiter 16 |  |  |
|  | Subuiter 13 |  | There are established trees along the intended path. How will they be protected in the eividinin of pata? sit the counciat the palms in the Reserve are the eremnant ones planted in memory of some of the local men who died in WW1? |
| 4 submitters advocate reinstating memorial palm trees that have been removed in the past. | Sumiter 14 |  | Site is of historical significance - avenue of honour palms - some missing, they |
|  | 15 |  | There is no reference to replacing the significant palm planting to commemorating fallen soldiers.... what a wonderful legacy the reinstatement would be! |
|  | Submiter 32 |  | The site is of historical significance: 1920 (ceremony attended by by Crs. Liston Fowler and Dennis). This Avenue should be restored |
|  | Submiter 50 |  |  |


| Trees \& planting - General |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regarding the provision of new trees, opinion varied <br> -3 appreciating the additional trees - 4 comments implying that Counci should be doing more to green the local area | Submitter 19 | ditional Tree Panting is welcome. |  |
|  | Submiter 36 | planting oftres as part of the plan |  |
|  | Subniter 28 | I appreciate that the council is willing to plant more trees | not enough planting |
|  | Submiter 41 |  | Need to plant more trees and scrubs [shrubs?] |
|  | Subniter 19 |  | t's obvious when walking around Williamstown that we are falling behind other Councils by not planting enough trees and we are falling behind most other Melbourne Councils |
|  | Submiter 31 |  | am sick and tired of hearing that council has a plan for greening the suburbs but <br> street planting effectively now - lack of watering, lack of cutting back suckers, lack of proper protection in early stages of planning |
| Regarding existing trees <br> -1 viewed the masterplan as <br> having limited impact <br> -2 disapproving of tree removal | Submitter 49 | Iminted impact on trees |  |
|  | Subniter 28 |  | removal of exsting trees |
|  | Subniter 29 |  | 1 loss of mature trees enabiling tenis court expansion |
| 1 submitter seeks more detailed information on trees | ${ }^{42}$ |  | Can you clearly indicate location of existing trees on the plans - current drawings are inaccurate. Can you indicate which existing trees will be maintained, which will be removed, what new trees will be planted and where? |

Dennis Reserve Master Plan
Community Feedback Summary - PROCESS \& DELIVERY

| Summary | Submitter | Community Feedback |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Strengths | Weaknesses \& Uncertainty |
|  |  | = Submitter has more than one comment in ther | topic |
| Masterplanning process |  |  |  |
| Importance of masterplan development acknowledged by 1 submitter | Submiter 14 | The development of a masterplan for a city park is extremely important |  |
| 5 submitters were unhappy with the time taken to masterplanning Council as being indecisive. | miter 43 |  | ago! |
|  | ${ }^{44}$ |  | Coundils unikely to reach a decision on it |
|  | Ubitter 21 |  | Pretty short on detail and 4-6 year implementation too long. Especially given the procrastination of council last few years |
|  | Submiter 45 |  | This time taken (7 years+) to get to this logical outcome. I vote for councillors to make decisions - not to delay for 7 years. Entire process has been driven by hidden agendas. |
|  | Subuiter 47 |  | No fim time ine - this has arready taken years to getto this stage. |
| 2 submitters suggest removing fences and allowing public accessto the Ladies Bowling Club greens while the lengthy planning process continues. | Subuniter 34 |  | With regards the staged nature of the re-development of Dennis Reserve, I ask that the fences around the Ladies' Bowling Club site be removed and the building be fenced off (which is to be demolished) so that the commun space while planning takes place for the master plan proper. |
|  | ubmiter 38 |  | The closure of the Williamstown Ladies Bowling Club occurred when they mbined with the adjacent Men's Bowling Club. The site has been vacant for activity during that period. |
| 1 submitter optimistic about the next stages of the process | Subuiter 34 | I look forward to more positive discussion and action on how the master plan can be improved for the majority of the community ty of the community. |  |




| Summary | Submitter | Community Feedback |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Strengths | Weaknesses \& Uncertainty |

Cost \& demolition


| 3 submitters questioned who will be unding the project, particularly tennis facilities. | Submitter 38 |  | Who will be tunding the constuction of the eew tenis cours? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subuniter 42 |  | Howi is this whole eroject to be tunded? Is Tennis Australie contributin |
|  | Subniter 35 |  | Finaly what is the source of the funds tor the new tenis coid |

Dennis Reserve Master Plan
Community Feedback Summary - MISCELLANEOUS
Summary
Submitter $\quad$ Strengths
Community Feedback
upgrade positivity


Balancing user needs

| 11 submitters expressed approval of how the needs of different user groups are being balanced | Submiter 02 | The plan balances the nededs of the tenis club, elderly |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sumititer 03 | Beter use of space forall ages. |  |
|  | Submiter 09 | Maximising active and passive recreation space |  |
|  | Sumiter 20 | Space for alilincuding different zones and space for |  |
|  | Summiter 21 | Facilites for both Tenlis Club and other groups |  |
|  | Submiter 41 | Caiers for the needs of several groups |  |
|  | Submiter 42 | Better utilisation of space, tennis court and senior citizen facilities |  |
|  | Submiter 43 | Much improved facilities for tennis, senior citizens and |  |
|  | Submiter 47 | Good compromise in trying to meet every ones needs. |  |


| Aesthetics \& Character |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mixed opinions regarding general aesthetics and local character: - 2 sub views <br> 2 submitters express negative views | Submiter 47 | Will visuly look much beter for all users of the area |  |
|  | Sumbiter 30 | Improving the tennis courts and still keep the character of the park and space |  |
|  | Submiter 15 |  | Loss of visual amenty |
|  | Submiter 37 |  |  |




## PLAY \& YOUTH PROVISIONS <br> OF THOSE WHO COMMENTED <br> 90UT OF 10 <br> ADVOCATED ONLY ONE PLAYGROUND, NOT TWO <br> Support for retaining the existing playground was mostly on cost/wastage grounds <br> Sentiments supporting relocation include <br> Safety concerns in the current locatio <br> closer proximity to the kindergarten <br> closer proximity to parking <br> 4 RESPONDENTS

## BUFFER SPACE

## 7 RESPONDENTS

EXPRESSED NEGATIVE VIEWS ON THE SPACE BETWEEN THE TENNIS COURTS AND BACK FENCES
Issues raised includ

- waste of land
- Loss of the pathway
- safety concerns

HIGHLIGHTED THE NEED TO CATER FOR OLDER CHILDREN / TEENS AS WELL


## LOWERED FENCES

Suggestion: Provide lowered fences
Propose to provide fences that are lowered in the centre of the court, where there is a lower likelihood of stray balls escaping. They would be valuable on the western side, and potentially on the eastern side, subject to the design of the space between the courts and back fences (refer to p 4
( - Visually more inviting - helps to signal that these are public courts, not privatised spaces

Occasionally not as effective in keeping stray balls within the court space


## MULTISPORT FACILITIES

Suggestion: Provide multisport markings \& hoops on two southern courts
ropose two multisport courts with
Markings for halfcourt basketball

Basketball \& netball hoops a southern end of courts

- Sufficient buffer zones from forma tennis courts
- Helps invite public use and expands the pool of potentiatusers beyond the Tennis Club and people who enjoy tennis
- Helps to address concerns about the single-use nature
- Provides expanded recreation opportunities for older children / teenagers
- Not preferred by the tennis club, however the will stilt have priority access during lub times to all tennis courts onsite
- May cause some confusion for players involved in high-standard competition

TENNIS COURT ADVICE
DENNIS RESERVE


RETAINING THE PATH
Suggestion: Not necessary to retain from a pedestrian network perspective

- If a path is not provided along Melbourne Road edge, it may valuable as an alternative
It may be convenient for a small number of residents and people parked directly north of the site
$x$
Major anchors for Local foot traffic are northwest and northeast of the Reserve, not directly north, so it does not service these desire lines.
- This path would only connect up to a dead end street
- The path invites people to walk in an area which is more physically isolated and has comparatively less passive surveillance than alternative paths of movement (e.g. Lyons Street or proposed path along Melbourne Road)


FILL WITH LOW PLANTING

Clear that this space does not invite entry resolving safety concerns and removing dead endMay still be perceived as 'wasted space'. More convoluted entry to the rear of the adjacent properties.

## $\longleftrightarrow$

ess to rear property entries would be provided via an informal gravel path which is inconspicuous and does not encourage casual use.


FILL WITH GRASS

- No dead ends, helps to resolve safety concerns

May still be perceived as 'wasted space'
Similar issues as per "Retaining the path Option" re. allowing access to an area with
comparatively less passive surveillance
Lack of clear purpose of the space not ideal or territorial reinforcement


## GREEN SEATING ZONE IN

 EXPANDED FENCED AREA- No dead ends
- Space is not constrained in a limited strip
- Not 'wasted space' since it can now be used for passive recreation and as a comfortable area for audience to watch
- Better passive surveilance since it is not cut off from the tennis courts \& interaction between the spaces is possible
- Expanding the fenced area may not be received well by those who are opposed to the increased number of tennis courts. This may be eased by implementing the other recommendations to encourage public use.
- May be some extra challenges and expense integrating the fencing with the existing trees,Granitic sand
Artificial turf with moveable seating (ease of maintenance)Groundcover plantings (low enough to allow for easy ball retrieval) Fence



## SEATING NODES OUTSIDE FENCED AREA

- No dead ends
- Not 'wasted space' since it can now be used for passive recreation and as a comfortable area for audience to watch
- Depending on design of the fence: - limited interaction between seating nodes and courts
Views from seating nodes may be interrupted by fence
Alowered fence and gate on the eastern side
fresolve these issues
- Similar issues as per "Retaining the path Option' re. encouraging access to an area . however this design does provide better territorial reinforcementGranitic sand Artificial turf seating nodes (ease of maintenance)Low plantings
Fence



## FAQS

CAN THE COURTS BE MOVED CLOSER TO THE FENCE?
No, existing mature trees need to be retained and moving the court closer would intrude on the tree protection zones.

WHAT IS PASSIVE SURVEILLANCE?
This is a CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principle that aims to keep potential offenders and intruders under observation through the creation of environments where there is sufficient opportunity for people engaged in their normal behaviour to observe the space around them
WHAT IS TERRITORIAL REINFORCEMENT?
This is a CPTED principle which implies the use of physical attributes to express stewardship of a space. With good territorial reinforcement it is clear that someone cares about the space and it is designed with a clear purpose.

BUFFER SPACE OPTIONS
DENNIS RESERVE

## FOR BOTH PLANS

$=$ Indicative seating nodes congregation spaces Intended to appeal particularly to teens / olde children
$\gg$
Central path realigned to avoid doubling-up of paths at the eastern end and optimise the useable spaces

Tree retention is the same as per the current masterplan

 school so likely to be well used

- Playground further away from 'living
areas' of adjacent property
- Playground in a location perceived to
be safe
- Playground closer to kindergarte
x - More expensive than retaining
existing playground location
- Open grassed space more fragmented

